

REMARKS

Upon entry of the above amendments, independent claim 2-21 will be pending.

In the outstanding Office Action dated September 09, 2004, the Abstract was objected to for exceeding the range of 50 to 150 words. A marked up version is included above.

Claim 1 was rejected on prior art grounds. Specifically, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kogge (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,856) in view of Fables et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,697). In response, claim 1 has been canceled and claims 2-21 have been added.

Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 2 recites a first processor communicating with one or more remote subordinate processors. The first processor performs at least one of solving a given problem and distributing processing required to solve the given problem among the one or more subordinate processors. When processing is distributed among the one or more subordinate processors, bidding information is provided to the one or more subordinate processors. One or more bids submitted by the one or more subordinate processors are responded to.

Kogge teaches a dynamic multi-mode processing array. Kogge does not teach multi-mode software. Fables et al. teaches a computer processing and programming method using autonomous data handlers. Referring to FIG. 4 of Fables et al., the logic web programming method includes selecting the appropriate input and output handler types, configuring the interface handler by deciding which input conditions need to be

satisfied in order to call a method handler, determining whether to use a timeout period/method, and defining which additional molecule or next molecule will be loaded with data processing instructions. Fables et al., col. 11, lines 8 to 31.

Applicants note that neither these references nor any other reference of record, whether considered alone or in an proper combination, teaches or suggests a first processor that communicates with remote subordinate processors and teaches or suggests providing bid information to the subordinate processors and responding to bids submitted thereby.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims each meet the patentability requirement of §102 and §103.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any questions regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/24/05

By:


Anthony L. Miele, Attorney for Applicants
Registration Number 34.393
Miele Law Group
137 South Main Street
Natick, MA 01760
Phone: 508-275-2173 Fax: 508-319-3001